



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,490	11/21/2003	Barry D. Atkins	RSW920030244US1	2514

43168 7590 07/13/2007
MARCIA L. DOUBET LAW FIRM
PO BOX 422859
KISSIMMEE, FL 34742

EXAMINER

TRUONG, THANHNGA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2135

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/13/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/719,490

Applicant(s)

ATKINS ET AL.

Examiner

Thanhnga B. Truong

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed on April 23, 2007 has been entered. Claims 1-10, 12-21 are pending. Claim 11 is cancelled and claim 21 is newly added by the applicant.

Response to Argument

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 and 12-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 16 recites "A system for enabling an entity to have seamless access to a plurality of aggregated services which have different identity requirements, comprising: means for initially authenticating the entity, by a first authentication component, for access to a first service using an identity provided by the entity; means for mapping the provided identification to the differing identity requirements of at least one other service to be aggregated with the first service, thereby establishing mapped identity requirements for each of the at least one other services; means for subsequently authenticating the entity for access to each of the at least one other services, by an authentication component associated with that other service, using the mapped identity requirements; and means for aggregating each of the at least one other services and the first service, if the authentications thereof are successful into an aggregated result." The claim means plus function claim language is normally to be interpreted as the hardware to perform the functionality. However, claim 19 of the invention provides evidence that means plus function for this claim 16 appears to be interpreted as just software. Therefore, claim 16 recites a non-statutory subject matter.

Art Unit: 2135

Claims 17-18 are depended on claim 16, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 16 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-9, 11-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joshi et al (US 7,134,137 B2), and further in view of Chandra et al (US 7,130,885 B2).

a. Referring to claim 1:

i. Joshi teaches a computer-implemented method of providing cross-domain authentication in a computing environment (column 5, lines 30-55 of Joshi), comprising steps of:

(1) providing security credentials of an entity to an initial point of contact that provides content aggregation in the computing environment (**column 2, lines 48-50 and 53-54; column 7, lines 18-21 of Joshi**);

(2) passing the provided credentials from the initial point of contact to a trust proxy (**column 7, lines 15-27 of Joshi**);

(3) authenticating the passed credentials with an authentication service in a local security domain of the trust proxy to authenticate the entity for accessing content from at least one local content service, each of the at least one local content services operable to provide its content from the local security domain for aggregation, by the initial point of contact, in an aggregated view (**column 7, lines 15-21; column 8, lines 46-58 of Joshi**); and

(4) using the authentication performed by the local authentication service to seamlessly authenticate the entity for accessing other content from at least one remote content service in each of at least one selected remote

security domains, each of the at least one remote content services operable to provide its content from its remote security domain for aggregation, by the initial point of contact, in the aggregated view(see **Figure 28 and more details in column 29, lines 63-67 through column 30, lines 1-7; column 48, lines 44-59 of Joshi**).

ii. Although Joshi teaches a computer-implemented method of providing cross-domain authentication in a computing environment (column 5, lines 30-55 of Joshi), Joshi is silent on the capability of providing the content aggregation in the computing environment. On the other hand, Chandra teaches this limitation on column 89, lines 59-63; column 92, lines 56-61 of Chandra.

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have modified Joshi's system with the teaching of Chandra for providing data to applications from an access system (**column 1, lines 41-42 of Joshi**).

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) have modified Joshi's system with the teaching of Chandra for providing transportable applications, multiple-page electronic messages and electronic messages that are linked and aggregated (**column 1, lines 18-20 of Chandra**).

b. Referring to claim 2:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) when the using step further comprises the steps of: consulting policy information to determine which of a plurality of remote security domains should be selected as the at least one remote security domain; and passing the information from the local authentication service to each of the determined remote security domains (**column 48, lines 26-59 of Joshi**).

c. Referring to claim 3:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the using step enables each of the remote content services in the selected remote security domains to be accessed by the entity

Art Unit: 2135

without requiring the entity to provide its security credentials for those remote content services (**column 18, lines 60-64 of Joshi**).

d. Referring to claim 4:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein a credential mapping operation is performed to map the provided security credentials to the entity's security credentials for each remote content service (**column 12, lines 58-67 through column 13, lines 1-5; column 33, lines 4-19 of Joshi**).

e. Referring to claim 5:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the entity is an end user (**column 33, lines 4-6 of Joshi**).

f. Referring to claim 6:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the initial point of contact is a portal interface (**column 34, lines 17-28 of Joshi**).

g. Referring to claim 7:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the passing step is performed by a proxy of the initial point of contact (**column 7, lines 15-27 of Joshi**).

h. Referring to claim 8:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the proxy of the initial point of contact performs a protocol conversion, when passing the provided credentials, from a first protocol used in the providing step to a second protocol used by the trust proxy (**column 3, lines 3-21 of Joshi**).

i. Referring to claim 9:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the first protocol is Hypertext Transfer Protocol ("HTTP") or a security-enhanced version thereof (**column 3, lines 3-4; column 6, lines 25-33 of Joshi**).

j. Referring to claim 11:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the initial point of contact provides an aggregation of a plurality of Web services (**column 6, lines 60-67 of Joshi**).

k. Referring to claim 12:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the using step further comprises the steps of: forwarding a security token from the local authentication service to a remote trust proxy in each of the selected remote security domains; and using the forwarded security token, at each of the remote trust proxies, to authenticate the entity with an authentication service in the remote security domain (**column 48, lines 18-43 of Joshi**).

l. Referring to claim 13:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein results of the authentication by the authentication service in the local security domain and results of each authentication by the authentication services in each selected remote security domain are returned to the initial point of contact (**column 48, lines 44-59 of Joshi**).

m. Referring to claim 14:

i. Joshi and Chandra further teaches:

(1) further comprising the step of determining, by the initial point of contact, which of the content and the other content can be aggregated by the initial point of contact based on the returned results (**column 48, lines 44-59 of Joshi**) and (**column 13, lines 9-19 of Chandra**).

n. Referring to claim 15:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the entity has security credentials, in at least one of the selected remote security domains, that differ from the provided security credentials, and wherein the using step transparently maps the provided security credentials to the different security credentials (**column 12, lines 58-67 through column 13, lines 1-5; column 33, lines 4-19 of Joshi**).

o. Referring to claim 16-17:

i. These system claims are drawn to the system corresponding to the method of using same as claimed in claims 1-15. Therefore system claims 16-17 correspond to method claims 1-16, and are rejected for the same reasons of anticipation (obviousness) as used above.

p. Referring to claim 18:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the entity is a programmatic entity (**column 41, lines 7-17 of Joshi**).

q. Referring to claims 19-20:

i. These system claims are drawn to a computer program product corresponding to the method of using same as claimed in claims 1-15. Therefore a computer program product claims 16-17 correspond to method claims 1-15, and are rejected for the same reasons of anticipation (obviousness) as used above.

r. Referring to claim 20:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the initial identity information is a name and password associated with the using entity (**column 20, lines 36-38 of Joshi**).

s. Referring to claim 21:

i. The combination of teaching between Joshi and Chandra teaches the claimed subject matter. Chandra further teaches:

(1) further comprising the step of rendering, by the initial point of contact, the aggregated view (**column 13, lines 9-19 of Chandra**).

Art Unit: 2135

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joshi et al (US 7,134,137 B2), in view of Chandra et al (US 7,130,885 B2), and further in view of Bradee (US 7,131,000).

a. Referring to claim 10:

i. The combination of teaching between Joshi and Chandra teaches the claimed subject matter. Joshi further teaches an access system using different kind of communications protocols, such as, HTTP and remote procedure calls (RPC), however, they are silent on the SOAP, which is another protocol just like RPC. On the other hand, Bradee teaches:

(1) wherein the second protocol is Simple Object Access Protocol ("SOAP") **(column 5, lines 25-31 of Bradee)**.

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have modified Joshi-modified's system with the teaching of Bradee for providing data to applications from an access system **(column 1, lines 41-42 of Joshi)**.

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) have modified Joshi-modified's system with the teaching of Bradee that delivers the ability to effectively secure and manage all the various network-based interactions **(column 2, lines 24-26 of Joshi)**.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanhnga (Tanya) Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-3858.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached at 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2135

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

TBT

July 06, 2007

Chanhong B. Du
AU 2135